

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA

CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION

Before:

THE HON'BLE JUSTICE SAUGATA BHATTACHARYYA

W.P.A. 900 OF 2025

**SRI UJJWAL MONDAL
VS.
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.**

For the Petitioner : Ms. Ananya Neogi
Mr. Sayan Mukherjee
Ms. Anushkha Ghosh

For the UOI : Mr. Brajesh Jha
Ms. Banani Bhattacharya

Heard on: 03.12.2025

Judgment on: 03.12.2025

SAUGATA BHATTACHARYYA, J:

1. Matter is heard in presence of learned advocates representing the petitioner and Union of India.
2. Petitioner participated in selection process for being appointed as Constable (GD) in Central Armed Police Forces (CAPFs). After being qualified in written test petitioner was medically examined first on 5th

October, 2024 and he was declared medically unfit. In medical examination report dated 5th October, 2024 petitioner was declared medically unfit due to hyper pigmented patch over left eye brow (Melanoma). Petitioner preferred review questioning medical report dated 5th October, 2024.

3. It is submitted that at the instance of concerned respondent authority petitioner was examined by the medical expert of IQ City Medical College Hospital, Durgapur (hereinafter referred to as “said hospital”) on 8th October, 2024 and petitioner was declared dermatologically fit. On the same date in review medical examination petitioner was declared medically unfit on the ground of compound nevus. It is contended on behalf of the petitioner that as petitioner was declared dermatologically fit by the medical expert of said hospital compound nevus ought not to be a cause to declare the petitioner medically unfit.

4. Mr. Jha, learned advocate representing Union of India in reference to paragraph 9 of the writ petition has submitted that examination by the medical expert of said hospital was not at the instance of CAPFs, rather petitioner decided to get medical report from different medical expert. On behalf of Union of India prayer of the petitioner is opposed as in review medical examination petitioner was declared medically unfit.

5. On perusal of a document at page 7 of the supplementary affidavit affirmed by the petitioner on 2nd July, 2025 it appears that submission made on behalf of the respondent authority that petitioner on his own went to said hospital for obtaining another medical report is found to be not correct as it is stated in the medical report dated 8th October, 2024 issued by the medical expert of said hospital that cost of medical examination was borne by CRPF not by the petitioner himself which goes to show that petitioner at the instance of CRPF was medically examined by the doctor of said hospital.

6. In addition thereto, nothing is demonstrated on behalf of respondents that in the event it is a case of compound nevus petitioner needs to be declared medically unfit. Moreover, as per report dated 8th October, 2024 issued by the consultant dermatologist of said hospital it was declared that petitioner was dermatologically fit.

7. In the aforesaid conspectus, concerned respondent authority is directed to treat the petitioner medically fit and consider the petitioner's appointment in the post of Constable (GD) in CAPFs if petitioner is otherwise eligible.

8. Writ petition stands disposed of.

9. There shall be, however, no order as to costs.

10. Urgent photostat certified copy of this judgment, if applied for, be given to the parties on usual undertaking.

(SAUGATA BHATTACHARYYA, J.)